

Glossary

7Q10	The lowest seven day average flow that occurs on average once every 10 years
°C	degrees Celsius
% WA	per cent Wetted Area
ADO	Affected Dam Owner
AWU	Affected Water User
cfs	Cubic Feet per Second
cfs/m	Cubic Feet per Second per square Mile
GIS	Geographic Information System
GRAF	Generic Resident Adult Fish
HST	Habitat Stressor Thresholds
HMU	Hydromorphological Unit
IPOCR	Instream Public Uses and Outstanding Characteristics
m	Meters
MA	the Commonwealth of Massachusetts
MesoHABSIM	a computer of meso-scale habitat simulation
NH	The state of New Hampshire
NHDES	The New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services
NHNB	New Hampshire Natural Heritage Bureau
p	Proportions of each species in the community or collection
PISF	Protected InStream Flow
R&G	Rearing and Growth
RSA	Revised Statutes Annotated
SIFI	Special Interest Fish and Invertebrates
temp.	Temperature
TFC	Target Fish Community
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
USGS	United States Geological Survey
WMP	Water Management Plan
WWTP	WasteWater Treatment Plant
XFC	eXisting Fish Community
YOY	Young of Year

Table of Contents

Topic	Page
Executive Summary	i
Glossary	xii
Table of Contents	xiv
List of Figures	xvi
List of Tables	xx
Credits	xiii
Introduction	1
Part 1. Locations and the Protection Goals for IPUOCR Entities	1
I.) Recreation	1
II.) Fishing	8
III.) Public Water Supply	9
IV.) Pollution Abatement	11
V.) Hydroelectric Energy Production	12
VI.) Fish and Wildlife Habitat	14
<i>Study Area</i>	14
<i>Segments of the Souhegan River</i>	17
<i>Temperature Data</i>	18
<i>Bio-Periods</i>	25
<i>Wetland/Riparian Wildlife Habitat</i>	28
VII.) Aquatic and Fish Life Maintenance and Enhancement	30
VIII.) RTE: Fish, Wildlife, Vegetation and Natural/Ecological Communities	30
A. Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Wildlife	30
Wood Turtle (<i>Clemmys insculpta</i>)	30
Fowlers Toad (<i>Bufo fowleri</i>)	34
Pied-Billed Grebe (<i>Podilymbus podiceps</i>)	35
Osprey (<i>Pandion haliaetus</i>)	35
Common Loon (<i>Gavia immer</i>)	35
B. Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Plants	35
Long's Bitter Cress (<i>Cardamine longii</i> Fern.)	35
Wild Garlic (<i>Allium canadense</i>)	36
Wild Senna (<i>Cassia hebecarpa</i>)	36
C. Natural Communities	36
High Energy Riverbank (Twisted Sedge (<i>Carex torta</i>) Low Riverbank Community and Fern Glade)	37
Southern New England Floodplain Forest: Silver Maple (<i>Acer saccharinum</i>) <i>Floodplain Forest</i>	38
Southern New England Floodplain Forest: Sycamore (<i>Platanus occidentalis</i>) <i>Floodplain Forest</i>	39
Oxbow/Backwater Marsh	40

Table of Contents (continued)

Topic	Page
IX.) Environmental/Fish Habitat	42
Target Fish Community Development	42
Fish and Invertebrate Sampling	42
Existing Fish Community	43
Existing Invertebrate Community	44
Comparison of TFC to the Existing Souhegan River Fish Community	45
Habitat Use, Pollution Tolerance, Thermal Regime Classification Guilds	45
Comparison of Species Within the TFC and the Existing Fish Communities	47
Comparison of TFC and Existing Community Species to Souhegan River Suitable Habitat Availability	51
Indicator Species	52
Habitat Suitability Criteria	53
Habitat Data Collection	54
Mapping	54
Rating Curves for Sites	54
Reach 1	56
Reach 2	59
Reach 3	62
Reach 4	65
Reach 5	68
Reach 6	71
Reach 7	74
River Restoration Simulation	76
River Simulation Results	78
Habitat Time Series Analysis	85
R&G Bio-Period	87
Recommendation	89
Atlantic Salmon Spawning Bio-period (October 1 through November 15)	90
Recommendation	91
Overwintering Bio-period (November 15 through February 28)	91
Spring Flood Bio-period (March 1 through April 30)	92
American shad bioperiod	92
Recommendation	93
GRAF spawning bio-period (May 1 through June 15)	93
Recommendation	94
Discussion	94

Table of Contents (continued)

Topic	Page
Part 2. Hydrographs	98
I.) Representative Hydrographs	98
II.) Comparison of PISF to Representative Hydrographs	103
III.) Water quality standards	115
IV.) Discussion of how the proposed PISF values meet the criteria	117
V.) Preliminary determination of Designated River reaches	121
References	125
Appendices	
Appendix 1. Affected Dam Owners	128
Appendix 2. Affected Water Users	190
Appendix 3. Concurrent Flows and Hydrograph Simulations	219
Appendix 4. Recreation Surveys	229
Appendix 5: Temperature Conditions	234
Appendix 6: Target Fish Community	247
Appendix 7: Fish Data Collection	280
Appendix 8: Habitat Suitability Criteria	314
Appendix 9: Habitat Survey	338
Appendix 10: HMU Maps	344
Appendix 11a: Habitat Suitability Maps	356
Appendix 11b: Habitat Suitability Maps	467
Appendix 12: Rating Curves	547
Appendix 13: Habitat Time Series Analysis	642
Appendix 14: Verification of Model Transferability	662
Appendix 15: Discussion of Site 11	675
Appendix 16: Floodplain Transects	699
Appendix 17: Example of calculations used in the development of fish habitat based prescriptions of protected flows for the Souhegan River	709

List of Figures

Figure and Caption	Page
Figure 1. View of the Upper Souhegan River looking upstream from Route 31 bridge, October 10, 2005.	2
Figure 2. Boating access point at Route 31 Bridge, Upper Souhegan River on October 10, 2005.	3
Figure 3. Hand painted gage at the shorebank fishing access on the Upper Souhegan River in Greenville, New Hampshire.	6
Figure 4. Boaters Downstream of Route 31 Bridge, October 10, 2005.	7
Figure 5. Location of the Greenville Water Supply, the Tobey Reservoir. USGS Greenville Topographic Quadrangle 1988.	10
Figure 6. Map of study area	15
Figure 7. Map showing the location of temperature probes (Red), impoundments (Blue I-numbers), and reference points of interest (Green) on the Souhegan River.	20
Figure 8. Souhegan River longitudinal temperature profile for the period of days common to the 2005 temperature data.	23
Figure 9. Souhegan River longitudinal profile for the period of days common to the 2004 temperature data.	24
Figure 10. Bio-periods identified for the Souhegan River displayed over the Souhegan River daily mean hydrograph based on 71 years of record.	27
Figure 11. Flow Sensitive Bioperiods for RTE Wildlife and Natural Communities	32
Figure 12. Percentages of Upper Souhegan River TFC and existing fish community species by habitat use classification guilds.	46
Figure 13. Percentages of Lower Souhegan River TFC and existing fish community species by habitat use classification guilds.	47
Figure 14. Comparison of proportions of fish species and their suitable habitats for the Upper Souhegan River.	51
Figure 15. Comparison of proportions of fish species and their suitable habitats for the Lower Souhegan River.	52
Figure 16. Hydrograph for the USGS stream gage at Wildcat Falls for the duration of the hydromorphological mapping period.	55
Figure 17. Habitat Rating curves for Reach 1 species during the R&G bio-period.	56
Figure 18. Habitat Rating curves for Reach 1 species during the Spawning bio-period.	57
Figure 19. Habitat Rating curves for Atlantic salmon and American shad spawning bio-period in Reach 1.	58
Figure 20. Habitat Rating curves for Reach 2 species during the R&G bio-period.	59
Figure 21. Habitat Rating curves for Reach 2 species during the Spawning bio-period.	60
Figure 22. Habitat Rating curves for Atlantic salmon and American shad spawning bio-period in Reach 2.	61

List of Figures

Figure and Caption	Page
Figure 23. Habitat Rating curves for Reach 3 species during the R&G bio-period.	62
Figure 24. Habitat Rating curves for Reach 3 species during the Spawning bio-period.	63
Figure 25. Habitat Rating curves for Atlantic salmon and American shad spawning bio-period in Reach 3.	64
Figure 26. Habitat Rating curves for Reach 4 species during the R&G bio-period	65
Figure 27. Habitat Rating curves for Reach 4 species during the Spawning bio-period.	66
Figure 28. Habitat Rating curves for Atlantic salmon and American shad spawning bio-period in Reach 4.	67
Fig Figure 29. Habitat Rating curves for Reach 5 species during the R&G bio-period.	68
Figure 30. Habitat Rating curves for Reach 5 species during the Spawning bio-period.	69
Figure 31. Habitat Rating curves for Atlantic salmon and American shad spawning bio-period in Reach 5.	70
Figure 32. Habitat Rating curves for Reach 6 species during the R&G bio-period.	71
Figure 33. Habitat Rating curves for Reach 6 species during the Spawning bio-period.	72
Figure 34. Habitat Rating curves for Atlantic salmon and American shad spawning bio-period in Reach 6.	73
Figure 35. Habitat Rating curves for Reach 7 species during the R&G bio-period.	74
Figure 36. Habitat Rating curves for Reach 7 species during the Spawning bio-period.	75
Figure 37. Habitat Rating curves for Atlantic salmon and American shad spawning bio-period in Reach 7.	76
Figure 38. Habitat Rating curves for Reach 1 river restoration simulation species during the R&G bio-period.	79
Figure 39. Habitat Rating curves for Reach 2 river restoration simulation species during the R&G bio-period.	80
Figure 40. Habitat Rating curves for Reach 3 river restoration simulation species during the R&G bio-period.	81
Figure 41. Habitat Rating curves for Reach 4 river restoration simulation species during the R&G bio-period.	82
Figure 42. Habitat Rating curves for Reach 5 river restoration simulation species during the R&G bio-period.	83
Figure 43. Habitat Rating curves for Reach 6 river restoration simulation species during the R&G bio-period.	84

Figure and Caption	Page
Figure 44. Habitat Rating curves for Reach 7 river restoration simulation species during the R&G bio-period.	85
Figure 45. Comparison of the lowest flow data points in the “wet” and “average” three year hydrographs.	100
Figure 46. Amplification of low and high flow duration curves for selected hydrographs at the USGS gage.	101
Figure 47. Monthly net withdrawal minus return flow (cfs).	102
Figure 48. Comparison of the lowest flow data points in the “wet” and “average” three year hydrographs.	105
Figure 49a. Comparison of Fish PISF to Upper Souhegan River hydrograph for the last 5 years.	112
Figure 49b. Comparison of Fish PISF to Upper Souhegan River hydrograph for the last 5 years (magnified).	113
Figure 50. Comparison of Fish PISF to Upper Souhegan River hydrograph for the dry 3-year hydrograph.	114
Figure 51. Comparison of Fish PISF to Lower Souhegan River hydrograph for the dry 3-year hydrograph.	114
Figure 52. Synthesized PISF for the Upper Souhegan River.	118
Figure 53. Synthesized PISF for the Lower Souhegan River.	118
Figure 54. Daily flow frequency statistics for the Souhegan River (based on the USGS gage in Merrimack).	121
Figure 55. Comparison of Upper Souhegan River instream flows to daily flow frequencies	122
Figure 56. Comparison of Lower Souhegan River instream flows to daily flow frequencies.	122
Figure 57. Comparison of Dry 3-Year hydrograph to daily exceedance frequencies – full scale.	124
Figure 58. Comparison of Dry 3-Year hydrograph to daily exceedance frequencies – magnified scale.	124

List of Tables

Table and Description	Page
Table 1. Estimated percent chance of finding the Upper Souhegan River runnable for whitewater boating.	4
Table 2. Runability of Upper Souhegan based on two hand-painted gages on upper river (Greenville and Route 31 Bridge).	5
Table 3. Gage reading and streamflow correlations at the Greenville, Route 31 bridge and Merrimack gages.	7
Table 4. New Hampshire Fish and Game Department Stocking Records for the Souhegan River during 2004.	9
Table 5. Details of permitted wastewater discharges in the Souhegan River designated segment.	11
Table 6. Protected Instream Flow (PSIF) for Pollution Abatement in the Souhegan River.	12
Table 7. Hydroelectric facilities on the Souhegan River designated segment.	13
Table 8. Impoundments and reference points of interest along the Souhegan River.	19
Table 9. River Water Temperature Data for the 2004 Field Season.	21
Table 10. River Water Temperature Data for the 2005 Field Season.	22
Table 11. Locations and water temperature measurements of impoundments within the upper Souhegan River watershed.	25
Table 12. Wildlife Species Observed Along the Souhegan River during 2005 Site Reconnaissance.	28-30
Table 13. Natural Communities, Wildlife Habitats and RTE Wildlife and Plants	31
Table 14. Comparison of proportions of fish species between the TFC and Upper Souhegan River existing fish community identifying under-represented, existing as expected, overly abundant, missing, and introduced species in the upper Souhegan River.	48
Table 15. Comparison of proportions of fish species between the TFC and Lower Souhegan River existing fish community identifying under-represented, existing as expected, overly abundant, missing, and introduced species in the upper Souhegan River.	50
Table 16. Species and life stages selected as habitat indicators in each specific reach.	87
Table 17. Recommended flow criteria for Atlantic salmon spawning bio-period.	90
Table 18. Recommended flow criteria for overwintering bio-period.	91
Table 19. Recommended flow criteria for spring flood bio-period.	92
Table 20. Recommended flow criteria for GRAF spawning bio-period.	93
Table 21. Recommended flow criteria for fish (bold values are flows not to be exceeded)	96
Table 22. The priority and importance of various aspects for maintenance and restoration of the aquatic fauna	97

List of Tables (continued)

Table and Description	Page
Table 23. Concurrent flow results for locations upstream of the Souhegan River USGS gage using the relationship $Q_{\text{upstream, cfsm}} = a \cdot Q_{\text{USGS, cfsm}}^b$.	99
Table 24. Comparison of Existing System Streamflow to the Recreation PISF.	103
Table 25. Comparison of Existing System Streamflow to the Hydropower PISF.	104
Table 26. Comparison of Existing System Streamflow to the Pollution Abatement PISF.	104
Table 27. Comparison of Existing System Streamflow to the Wood Turtle PISF.	106
Table 28. Comparison of Existing System Streamflow to the Fowlers Toad PISF.	107
Table 29. Comparison of Existing System Streamflow to the Wild Garlic and Wild Senna PISF.	108
Table 30. Comparison of Existing System Streamflow to the Twisted Sedge and Fern Glade PISF.	109
Table 31. Comparison of Existing System Streamflow to the Silver Maple Floodplain Forest PISF.	110
Table 32. Comparison of Existing System Streamflow to the Sycamore Floodplain Forest PISF.	110
Table 33. Comparison of Existing System Streamflow to the Oxbow/Backwater Marsh PISF.	111
Table 34. Comparison of Existing System Streamflow to the Fish PISF for the Upper Souhegan River.	112
Table 35. Comparison of Existing System Streamflow to the Fish PISF for the Lower Souhegan River.	114
Table 36. Comparison of Existing System Streamflow to the GRAF Spawning, high flow PISF for the Lower Souhegan River.	115

Acknowledgements

The undertaking of the first instream flow study for the State of New Hampshire is the product of many people who worked long and hard hours to achieve this final report. At the University of New Hampshire, Tom Ballestero had the lead for the project, as well as the groundwater-associated issues, concurrent flow field measurements, and the PISF statistics. Jennifer Jacobs reduced the concurrent flow data and developed the hydrologic records. Aiding the UNH efforts were: Joel Ballestero (field work, CAD, data reduction), Heather Ballestero (field efforts), Trisha Ballestero (field efforts), Alison Watts (field efforts), Matt Shump (PISF statistics) and Gary LeMay (field efforts).

Normandeau Associates, Inc. had primary responsibility for AWUs, ADOs, wetlands, and RTE species. Ms. Lee Carbonneau evaluated flow dependency of wetlands, wildlife and rare plants and natural communities along the Souhegan River corridor. This work included the identification of flow dependent species and their flow-sensitive bioperiods through database and literature review; and collection of water level, plant community and wildlife use measurements along transects at key river/floodplain locations. She mapped this information on aerial photographs and cross-sections for correlation with flow data and determined site specific flow needs for the flow dependent RTE plants, floodplain habitats, wetlands and wildlife species. Mr. Don Kretchmer was the original Normandeau project manager, plus also performed boating recreation surveys and provided write up of survey results for the report. Mr. Al Larson was acting Normandeau project manager and contributed to writing and editing of the report. Ms. Kimberly Peace collected and summarized AWU and ADO information. Mr. Dennis Pelletier provided GIS and graphics support. Mr. Drew Trested worked with the University of Massachusetts technicians on the fish and macroinvertebrate studies and contributed sections to the report.

The University of Massachusetts was responsible for fish and invertebrate habitat delineation, mapping, and requirements. Dr. Piotr Parasiewicz led this effort. The staff and technicians who contributed to data habitat data collection include: Jeffrey Fountain, Abigail Cadman, Richard Pecorrelli, Drew Trested, Gaston Gutiérrez, Christian Parasiewicz, Jeniffer Hogue, Jeffrey Legros, Joe Rogers, Jessica Dodge, David Ramos Montero, Jorge Gil, and Andres Lopez-Cotarelo. Sean Werle conducted invertebrate and mussel surveys as well as scuba reconnaissance of impoundments. The following students participated in identifying macro invertebrates: Roy Hunkins, Erin Shanley, James Harter and Heather Huntley.